amo REPORT

REPORT SERIES 1989

89-8 RESPONSE TO "COUNTY GOVERNMENT IN ONTARIO: REPORT OF THE CONSULTATION COMMITTEE TO THE MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS"

THE ASSOCIATION OF MUNICIPALITIES OF ONTARIO
AUGUST, 1989

90-01024/

ASSOCIATION OF MUNICIPALITIES OF ONTARIO

The Association of Municipalities of Ontario is a non-partisan voluntary organization united to promote the values of the municipal government system and the status of the municipal level of government as a vital and essential component of the total inter-governmental framework of Ontario and Canada.

The Association acts as the collective voice of Ontario's municipal governments and is organized to accomplish through cooperation and coordination, what the majority have neither the time nor the resources to do individually.

The Association represents some seven hundred municipal governments throughout Ontario. The governing body is composed of some eighty municipal elected and appointed officials, who in turn represent a wide range of municipal government interests.

The following Sections and affiliated municipal professional associations form an important part of the Association's structure and, therefore, play an important part in its activities in terms of the Board of Directors, program and policy development:

Association Sections

- County and Regional Section
- Large Urban Section
- Northern Ontario Section (FONOM/NOMA)
- Rural Section (ROMA)
- Small Urban Section (OSUM)

Association Affiliates:

- Association of Municipal Clerks and Treasurers of Ontario
- Association of Municipal Tax Collectors of Ontario
- Municipal Engineers Association
- Ontario Municipal Administrators Association
- Ontario Municipal Personnel Association
- Ontario Municipal Social Services Association
- Society of Directors of Municipal Recreation of Ontario
- Municipal Finance Officers' Association of Ontario

To the Municipal Clerk:

Please circulate this Report to the members of council and to the staff of your municipality. Additional copies are available at $10.00 each from the Publications Centre, Association of Municipalities of Ontario, 100 University Ave., Suite 805, Toronto, Ontario, M5J 1V6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2
BACKGROUND	3
AMO RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS	4
OTHER MATTERS	33
CONCLUSIONS	34
APPENDIX A	35
Membership of the 1989 Joint Section Committee on County Government	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following report represents the Association's response to the Report of the Consultation Committee to the Minister of Municipal Affairs entitled: "County Government in Ontario".

The County Government in Ontario report recognized certain problems with respect to representation and the current ability of counties to adequately deliver necessary services. The report proposed individual county studies and the suggestion of certain appropriate sizes for the most effective administration of individual municipalities within counties, appropriate county sizes and a division of responsibilities between counties and local municipalities.

Through representation from its constituent Sections, the Association has developed a consensus response to the report which contains support from all types of municipalities in Ontario. The Association, while agreeing with many of the proposals in the report retains one major philosophical difference from the report of the Consultation Committee. That difference is that AMO is recommending that there is no one set of numbers or complete set of responsibility divisions which can be uniformly applied across the Province. The Association is supportive of the individual county reviews which are proposed and emphasizes that these are the appropriate vehicles through which to determine population size, county council size and the designation of certain services as either local or county-wide.

AMO's comments have been submitted to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Association looks forward to meeting with the Minister in the future to present the results of its deliberations and trusts that the Minister will seriously consider the AMO response as presented.

INTRODUCTION

The Association is pleased to present the following position as a response to the Report of the Consultation Committee to the Minister of Municipal Affairs entitled: "County Government in Ontario."

The Association recognizes that there has been little change in the way counties operate in Ontario since the establishment of the Baldwin Act of 1849. While 10 regional governments were created in the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's as a result of rapid urban growth and the recognition of economies of scale in the provision of some services, counties have remained virtually unchanged.

There is recognition by many counties themselves and by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs that there is a need to deal with the increasing demands of residents, increasing urbanization and the need for efficient service delivery within counties.

The Association submitted a similar response to the report entitled: "Patterns for the Future" in June 1988. While the Association agrees that the question of small and separated municipalities will have to be addressed in terms of the individual county reviews proposed, the Association would like to advise the Minister of Municipal Affairs that the "Patterns for the Future" report contained a number of recommendations not addressed in the "County Government in Ontario" report. Issues such as suburban roads commissions and county roads committees as well as a number of recommendations with respect to special purpose bodies such as children's aid societies, boards of health and library boards were discussed in the "Patterns for the Future" report. The Association continues to feel that these matters as discussed and raised in the "Patterns for the Future" report should not be abandoned.

The Association would recommend that these matters be included in matters to be considered within the individual county studies which will be conducted around the Province. In that manner, perhaps they will not be overlooked as counties address service delivery matters, the committee structure and a large number of representation and accountability issues over the next few years.

The Association supports and encourages individual county reviews as proposed in that county governments recognize the current limitations and directions required for the future in order to effectively deliver the increasing amount of services requested by today's society.

BACKGROUND

As a result of a number of requests from various organizations including the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and a number of counties themselves requesting increased authority for county government, the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Honourable Bernard Grandmaitre announced the formation of the Advisory Committee on County Government in February, 1987. The purpose of this committee was to examine the role of counties and recommend changes which would address the role, functions and changing demands of counties.

One year later, in February, 1988, the Honourable John Eakins, Minister of Municipal Affairs released the "Report of the Advisory Committee on County Government: Patterns for the Future." Along with the release of this report, the Minister announced the formation of a task force, composed of members of the Provincial legislature to travel around the Province and discuss the report directly with councils and interested individuals. The title of the Provincial task force was later changed to the Consultation Committee on County Government and was chaired by Charlie Tatham, M.P.P., County of Oxford. The Consultation Committee was requested to examine problems related to smaller and separated municipalities, specific problems related to individual counties as well as outstanding issues from the "Patterns for the Future" report.

On April 20th, 1989, the Honourable John Eakins released the Report of the Consultation Committee on County Government entitled, "County Government in Ontario". In his release, the Minister requested comments from counties and interested organizations and individuals by July 14, 1989. Following a number of requests for extensions to this deadline, including requests from the Association's Small Urban Section (OSUM) and Rural Section (ROMA), an extension was eventually granted to September 1st, 1989.

Process for AMO Response

The Association of Municipalities of Ontario, in an attempt to prepare a response to the Report of the Consultation Committee on County Government, put together a Joint Section Committee on County Government which included representatives from the Association's four affected Section Executive Committees. The Committee was made up of individuals from each of the County and Regional Section, the Large Urban Section, the Rural Section (ROMA) and the Small Urban Section (OSUM). (Membership is outlined in Appendix A of the report).

The Joint Section Committee on County Government met on various occasions, considered the many municipal submissions which were forwarded to the Ministry and the Association and put together a draft report which was forwarded to the various Section Executive Committees and the AMO Board of Directors for approval. The Association is pleased to advise that the response position which has been arrived at has the support of each of the components of the membership with no minority viewpoint expressed by any of the Sections.

The Association is pleased to present the following consensus AMO position.

AMO RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE REPORT ENTITLED "COUNTY GOVERNMENT IN ONTARIO": REPORT OF THE CONSULTATION COMMITTEE TO THE MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

1. THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT RELEASE A POLICY STATEMENT WHICH OUTLINES ITS OBJECTIVES FOR A STRONG COUNTY SYSTEM. THIS STATEMENT WOULD PROVIDE DIRECTION FOR THE REORGANIZATION STUDIES OF INDIVIDUAL COUNTIES.

AMO Position

The Association supports this recommendation in principle and is of the view that the policy statement should address broad general guidelines which allow for a great degree of local flexibility to be incorporated into the individual county studies.

While supportive of the concept of a policy statement outlining objectives for a strong county system, the Association stresses that it is important to address the individual county situations with a maximum allowance for local flexibility within that policy statement. The Association is of the view that no individual county review should be restricted or confined in any significant way by the contents of the policy statement given the uniqueness of each county situation.

2. THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT POLICY STATEMENT INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS OF PRINCIPLE:

- COUNTIES ARE DISTINCT FROM OTHER FORMS OF GOVERNMENT, REFLECTING AND ENHANCING THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF COUNTY SOCIETY.
- IT IS IMPORTANT THAT IN A COUNTY FEDERATION, BOTH THE COUNTY AND LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES BE STRONG UNITS OF GOVERNMENT.
- THERE SHOULD BE A CLEAR DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES BETWEEN THE COUNTY AND THE LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES IN THE COUNTY SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT.
- COUNCILS AT BOTH LEVELS SHOULD BE ACCOUNTABLE AND REPRESENTATIVE.
- THE COUNTY SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE ADAPTABLE ENOUGH TO MEET FUTURE NEEDS.

- COUNTY GOVERNMENT SHOULD HAVE THE CAPACITY TO DEAL WITH THE IMPORTANT ISSUES OF THE DAY. IN ORDER TO COPE WITH THESE CONCERNS, COUNTIES MUST HAVE EFFECTIVE DECISION-MAKING ABILITY, AN ADEQUATE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL BASE, EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION AND STAFF SUPPORT AND APPROPRIATE LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY.

- THE PUBLIC MUST UNDERSTAND AND SUPPORT THE COUNTY'S ROLE.

- COOPERATION SHOULD BE MAINTAINED AND ENCOURAGED BETWEEN THE COUNTIES AND SEPARATED MUNICIPALITIES AS WELL AS BETWEEN DIFFERENT COUNTIES.

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of these general statements of principle.

The Association recognizes that any Provincial government policy statement on county government should contain such general statements of direction. The Association would once again stress the importance of flexibility in undertaking the individual county studies to allow for each county's particular circumstances and interpretation of these general principles.

3. THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT POLICY STATEMENT CONTAIN THE FOLLOWING SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS (#4 - 25) ON THE NATURE OF LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES, REPRESENTATION ON COUNTY COUNCIL, DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES, AND RELATIONSHIP WITH SEPARATED MUNICIPALITIES.

AMO Position

The Association is in agreement that the Provincial Policy Statement on county government should address the nature of local municipalities, representation on county council, division of responsibilities and relationship with separated municipalities but is of the view that the Association's response to these recommendations serves to best accommodate the individual differences in each county and allow for maximum flexibility.

The Association believes that the positions advocated in the following pages with respect to recommendations 4 to 25 are the views of the majority of municipal members and that the AMO response attempts to allow for maximum flexibility and individual county differences. While there are some matters that should perhaps be consistent throughout all counties, the Association is of the opinion that the responses to these recommendations best allow for individual flexibility and should be considered in terms of the Provincial policy statement.

4. LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES WITHIN COUNTIES BE ORGANIZED TO BE VIABLE, SELF-RELIANT ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS CAPABLE OF PROVIDING STRONG, EFFECTIVE, REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT FOR THEIR CITIZENS, SUCH STRONG LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES, AS ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS, SHOULD:

(A) ENCOMPASS COMPLETE SERVICE AREAS, INCLUDING SPACE FOR EXPANSION;

(B) RECOGNIZE AND ENHANCE THE LOCAL COMMUNITIES THAT MAKE UP LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES, FOR EXAMPLE, THROUGH THE ADOPTION OF WARD SYSTEMS, SUPPORT FOR LOCAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES SUCH AS BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT AREAS, AND OTHER INITIATIVES TO PROMOTE COMMUNITY IDENTITY; AND

(C) HAVE A SUFFICIENT POPULATION BASE TO SUPPORT EFFICIENT, COST-EFFECTIVE SERVICES. IN PRINCIPLE, LOCAL MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS SHOULD BE CONSOLIDATED TO HAVE A MINIMUM POPULATION BASE OF 4,000.

AMO Response

The Association supports the positive statements outlined in 4, 4(A) and 4(B) but suggests that (C) be reworded as follows:

(C) have a sufficient population base to support efficient, cost-effective services, and in considering the optimum size for such services, that the considerations raised in recommendation #5 should be taken into account in each individual county study.

The Association supports the positive statements outlined in (A) and (B) but suggests that individual counties, through their county studies, are in the best positions to interpret the size of municipality required to support efficient, cost-effective services. The Association also suggests that the considerations raised in recommendation #5 are extremely valid and should be taken into account and assessed in each of the individual county studies as factors which impact upon what may be determined to be an optimum size.

The Association is of the view that each individual county can assess its own situation in the best manner. A prime example of such a successful self-assessment is the restructuring scheme which recently received approval for the County of Lambton. In this particular situation, the County took it upon itself to review its structure on its own initiative and managed to achieved a consensus on a restructuring agreement which appeared to best suit its purposes.

Indeed, the Association would like to advise of the position of the County of Lambton as outlined in a response to the Report of the Consultation Committee entitled "County Government in Ontario" dated June, 1989. On the question of population size and representation the County of Lambton advises:

> "Therefore, the County of Lambton takes strong exception to the recommendations of the consultation committee regarding minimum population base for a municipality to be 4,000 people and representation on County Council to be based on the principle of representation by population, or within a 25% variance. These are not absolutely essential components of County reform."

Rather than impose what appears to be a somewhat arbitrary figure of 4,000 population upon municipalities, the Association is of the view that inefficiencies in representation and composition can best be addressed through each of the individual county studies which are proposed. The variable factors of population density, geographic isolation, nature of local economy and natural location of a service area are matters which can best be used to assist in determining optimum sizes in each individual county situation.

The Association would once again emphasize that each county in Ontario is unique in its own way and that the individual county reviews proposed are the best methods through which to determine the population base required to support efficient and cost-effective service delivery.

5. **NOTWITHSTANDING RECOMMENDATION 4, A LOCAL MUNICIPALITY COULD HAVE A POPULATION BASE LESS THAN 4,000 IF THE FOLLOWING CONSIDERATIONS WARRANT A SMALLER SIZE:**

- **POPULATION DENSITY**
- **GEOGRAPHIC ISOLATION**
- **NATURE OF LOCAL ECONOMY AND ITS RATE OF CHANGE**
- **NATURAL LOCATION OF A SERVICE AREA**

<u>AMO Position</u>

See AMO response to recommendation #4.

As stated in the response to recommendation #4, while the Association is not supportive of the 4,000 number being applied in a uniform manner across the Province, the Association is supportive of the examination of these factors in the determination of population sizes to be arrived at in each of the individual county reviews. Again, the Association views these as factors which are best used to assist in arriving at a local solution to this matter.

6. **THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF POLICE VILLAGES BE DISSOLVED AND THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE POLICE VILLAGES BE INCORPORATED INTO AN APPROPRIATE ADJACENT LOCAL MUNICIPALITY.**

AMO Position

The Association is in agreement with the recommendation but requests that such police villages be involved in the individual county reviews so they may be involved and have some say over their amalgamation.

The Association is in agreement with the Report of the Consultation Committee that police villages provide few services and their functions are difficult for the public to understand. While the Association is supportive of the dissolution of police villages, the Association requests that police villages be involved in the individual county reviews in order to have some input with respect to their dissolution and subsequent amalgamation with other municipalities.

7. **ALL LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES IN A COUNTY BE REPRESENTED ON COUNTY COUNCIL.**

AMO Position

The Association is in agreement with the recommendation.

The Association agrees with the "federation" concept of county council and is therefore supportive of maintaining representation of all local constituent municipalities on county council.

8. **THE MAXIMUM SIZE OF COUNTY COUNCILS BE 20 MEMBERS.**

AMO Position

The Association recommends that recommendation #8 be amended so as to read:

> **"That individual county councils may adjust membership within the framework of all local municipalities being represented on county council, that the optimum size of county council not be defined but that the actual size be defined as a result of each individual county study.**

The Association, as indicated in response to earlier recommendations, is of the view that there is no arbitrary number which should be applied across the Province. Rather, the Association is of the view that the results of individual county studies, including the determination of the size of county council, should not be predetermined in any way. Once again, the Association is of the view that every county is unique and that the optimum size for any given county council is best determined through an examination of local conditions.

9. **REPRESENTATION ON COUNTY COUNCILS BE BASED ON THE PRINCIPLE OF REPRESENTATION BY POPULATION. REPRESENTATION BY POPULATION WILL BE CONSIDERED TO BE ACHIEVED WHEN THE NUMBER OF ELECTORS PER REPRESENTATIVE IS WITHIN 25 PER CENT OF THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF ELECTORS PER REPRESENTATIVE IN THE COUNTY.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of this recommendation and believes that the 25 percent allowance for variability is best considered as a guideline throughout the individual county reviews.

The Association is generally supportive of the concept of representation by population but recognizes that true representation by population is not achievable in the majority of cases. The Association recognizes that the 25 percent allowance for variability is a useful guideline to follow. However, the Association would once again advise that the achievement of a greater degree of representation by population can best be achieved through individual county self-examination.

10. **NOTWITHSTANDING RECOMMENDATION 9:**

A) **GREATER VARIATIONS IN REPRESENTATION BY POPULATION ARE ACCEPTABLE TO PROVIDE REPRESENTATION FOR MUNICIPALITIES ESTABLISHED UNDER RECOMMENDATION 5; AND**

B) **NO MUNICIPALITY HAVE A MAJORITY OF THE REPRESENTATION ON COUNTY COUNCIL.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of these provisions but would suggest rewording recommendation 10(B) so that it would read:

> **(B) No municipality have a majority of the representation on county council and that as an added protection for municipalities, AMO recommends the consideration of a quorum system similar to the Ottawa-Carleton system whereby a quorum of municipal representatives is necessary to conduct a vote. Once again, these matters should be considered as possibilities in terms of each individual county review.**

The Association concurs that the factors of density, geographic isolation, nature of local economy and location of a service area are valuable factors which must be considered in terms of each individual review. AMO views this recommendation as supportive of its general position that each county is unique and requires its own review and determination of its own individual arrangement.

In addition, one of the necessary restrictions to complete representation by population is the position that no municipality have a majority on county council. The Association would suggest that, in conducting individual reviews, counties and the Province may wish to give consideration to the use of a quorum system such as that used in various regional municipalities including the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. This is a protection mechanism of sorts whereby a majority of municipalities must be present in order to conduct a vote. This may be useful in terms of preventing dominance of county council by two or three populated, and hence, well-represented municipalities.

The Association puts this forward in the spirit of a suggestion which may be useful to implement, particularly in those counties where the population splits are large.

Once again, these matters should be considered as possibilities in terms of each individual county review.

11. **HEADS OF ALL LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES, INCLUDING THE MAYORS OF TOWNS, BE REQUIRED TO SIT ON COUNTY COUNCIL.**

AMO Position

The Association is in agreement with this recommendation.

The Association agrees that because town mayors are the only heads of council who do not serve on county council, this causes confusion to the general public and has, in some instances, resulted in communications problems. Heads of all local municipalities should therefore serve on county council and there should not be an optional choice on this matter.

12. **SUBSTITUTION OF MEMBERS ON COUNTY COUNCIL NOT BE PERMITTED.**

AMO Position

The Association is in agreement with this recommendation.

The Association agrees with the report's claim that substitution on county council confuses accountability. Given the increasing complexity of local government, municipalities must be continually represented in a consistent manner in order to be constantly informed and operate effectively. These reasons serve to illustrate why no other government permits substitution and county council should be considered in a similar light.

13. **THE HEAD OF COUNTY COUNCIL BE SELECTED BY COUNCIL FROM AMONG THE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL AND BE PERMITTED TO SERVE ADDITIONAL TERMS.**

AMO Position

The Association is in agreement with this recommendation.

The Association agrees that the need for continuity and the increasing involvement by counties in more long term issues may cause county councils to wish to retain the head of county council for additional terms. This should clearly be permitted within the county council structure for those counties that may wish to do so.

14. **THE HEAD OF COUNTY COUNCIL BE CALLED COUNTY WARDEN, AND THAT IN FRENCH, THE HEAD OF COUNTY COUNCIL BE CALLED "PRÉSIDENT".**

AMO Position

The Association is in agreement with this recommendation.

The Association is of the view that the title of "county warden" will serve to clarify some confusion in the general public about the use of the term "warden". The Association is satisfied that in the many meetings conducted with county councils around the Province, that this is the preferred title amongst municipal representatives.

15. **A HEAD OF A LOCAL COUNCIL IN A COUNTY BE CALLED "MAYOR" IN TOWNS AND "REEVE" IN VILLAGES AND TOWNSHIPS. A LOCAL COUNCIL IN A VILLAGE OR TOWNSHIP MAY PASS A BY-LAW TO CALL THE HEAD OF COUNCIL "MAYOR".**

AMO Position

The Association is of the view that the heads of all municipalities should be called "mayor" and that there should not be an optional choice on this matter.

The Association believes that the term "mayor" is very clearly understood by the public to be the head of a council and that calling all heads of council "mayor" would serve to eliminate confusion with respect to municipal government. In addition, a great number of responses received from the Association's membership oppose an optional selection of title and feel that there should be a consistent and standardized term selected.

AMO would like to echo the views of its members on this matter and suggest that allowing local municipalities to pass by-laws to change the title of their head of council while other councils within the same county use a completely different title would be counter-productive and would cause even greater confusion among the electorate.

For this reason, the Association suggests the establishment of consistent titles for municipally elected officials across the Province and, for the benefit of clarity and public understanding, suggests that the title for the head of council be "mayor".

16. **ALL ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIVES ON COUNTY COUNCILS BE CALLED "COUNTY COUNCILLORS".**

AMO Position

The Association supports this recommendation subject to the removal of the word "additional".

As stated in response to earlier recommendations, the Association is supportive of the establishment of consistent titles across the Province for municipally elected officials and is therefore of the view that all representatives serving on county council should be called "county councillors" regardless of how they came to be on county council. In responding to this recommendation, the Association is acting on the assumption that each county study will address the method of local election in that particular area.

17. **IN ADDITION TO THE SERVICES COUNTIES ARE CURRENTLY RESPONSIBLE FOR, EITHER INDIVIDUALLY OR JOINTLY WITH OTHER COUNTIES OR SEPARATED MUNICIPALITIES, (HOMES FOR THE AGED, CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETIES, PUBLIC HEALTH),**

A) **COUNTIES HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES; AND**

B) **COUNTIES HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR SOCIAL SERVICES AND, WITHIN THAT RESPONSIBILITY, BE REQUIRED TO DELIVER GENERAL WELFARE ASSISTANCE.**

AMO Position

The Association opposes mandatory sole county authority for waste management and would re-iterate its position in favour of county delivery of general welfare assistance with 100 percent provincial funding.

And further, the Association recommends that the Province address the issue of accountability through special purpose bodies in the individual county studies.

The Association has spent a considerable amount of time over the past few years requesting amendments to the Municipal Act which would permit counties to enter the field of waste management. In particular, the Association recognizes that there are a number of municipalities in Ontario who recognize the waste management crisis and are attempting to unite the local municipalities under a common county system to attempt to address the problem. While recognizing that there are economies of scale to be gained from allowing waste management services to be provided at the county level, the Association would emphasize that this is a service which must have a significant degree of support within the county and which must address the situation of existing locally operated landfill sites fairly and equitably.

For this reason, the Association was pleased to see the introduction and ultimate passage of Bill 201: An Act to amend the Municipal Act which proposed permissive authority for counties to enter into waste management services on a two-thirds vote of county council representing a majority of local municipalities on county council. AMO continues to support permissive authority for waste management at the county level given the different situations which different counties are currently facing with respect to this pressing problem.

What the recommendation proposed in 17(A) serves to do is state that all counties, regardless of their geographic location, population or local municipal waste management capacity, must enter into waste management on their own with no participation at the local municipal level. The Association feels that this is a misguided suggestion which ignores individual county uniqueness and local autonomy and serves to tar all counties with the same brush. The Association views this

recommendation as somewhat contrary to the legislation introduced by the same government.

In addition, the Association views this recommendation as contrary to the notion of local county autonomy and local flexibility which is proposed to be addressed through the individual county studies.

The Association is therefore opposed to recommendation 17(A) but would suggest that waste management be considered by each county in terms of individual county studies in terms of whether or not it should be a county function in their particular case. In addition, AMO recommends that individual county studies, when considering the waste management issue, address any proposed problems which could be caused by existing local landfill sites, such as liability and long term care.

With respect to recommendation 17(B), the Association advises that it is not completely clear what all the social services are that counties are to be responsible for. The Association does recognize that the county level of government appears to be the appropriate level to deliver many social services such as homes for the aged and general welfare assistance. The Association would also caution that the Provincial-Municipal Social Services Review and the SARC report deliberations have not been finalized and that these major reports will undoubtably impact upon these particular recommendations.

The Association would advise that it has historically taken the position that social services are appropriately delivered at the upper-tier level but that core social service programs such as general welfare assistance, family benefits assistance and all related income programs as well as child welfare and children's services and services for the elderly should be funded by 100 percent Provincial funding.

AMO Report 88-6: "Pressures on the Partnership": Response to the Provincial-Municipal Social Services Review Discussion Paper states the following:

> "11.3 It is recommended that social services meeting these criteria be defined as "core provincial programs", and that they be funded at 100 % by the province.
>
> 11.4 It is recommended that such "core provincial programs" include:
>
> - all current social service programs funded 100% by the Province;
> - GWA/FBA income support and all related income programs, in a single integrated system;
> - child welfare and children's services;
> - services for elderly persons.
>
> And that consideration be given to the eventual inclusion of child care as a "core provincial program."

The Association re-iterates it's support for these recommendations.

In addition to these positions with respect to the services of waste management and social assistance, AMO recommends that accountability through various special purpose bodies should be addressed in the individual county studies. This comment is raised with respect to recommendation 17 due to the various special purpose bodies which are made use of in delivering certain aspects of social services such as children's aid societies and boards of health. However, the February 1988 report entitled, "Report of the Advisory Committee on County Government: Patterns for the Future", contained numerous recommendations pertaining to a range of special purpose bodies. The Association strongly recommends that the individual county reviews which take place should attempt to address these various special purpose bodies in an attempt to enhance the effective delivery of services through more accountable structures.

18. **IN ADDITION TO WEED CONTROL, COUNTIES BE GIVEN RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FOLLOWING, BUT WITH LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES GIVEN AUTHORITY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DELIVERY OF SUCH SERVICES:**

- **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**
- **SEWER AND WATER**

AMO Position

The Association is of the view that given the vast differences between counties in Ontario, that the services of sewer and water and economic development be included in recommendation 20 thereby allowing for both counties and local municipalities to be given permissive authority to undertake them.

The Association, in attempting to come to grips with this recommendation came to the conclusion that county authority for economic development and, particularly sewer and water services could indeed work in certain, more homogenously urbanized counties but that it would not be very effective in very rural counties where urban settlements are located great distances apart.

The Association concluded that these are items which, once again, cannot be imposed in a uniform fashion across the Province but must be considered in terms of the studies of individual counties. For this reason, the Association suggests that the responsibilities of sewer and water and economic development be added to recommendation 20 as matters to be considered in individual counties in terms of permissive authority.

In addition, recommendation 20 contains the suggestion that the acquisition and servicing of industrial land should be a permissive function to be determined by the county and the local municipality. It is logical to include the necessary functions of economic development and sewer and water along with industrial land servicing in determining which level of government is most appropriate to deal with these matters, given the inter-relationship between these functions.

19. **LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES HAVE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS:**

- **BUILDING INSPECTION**
- **FIRE SERVICES**
- **POLICING, WHERE DELIVERED LOCALLY**
- **BUSINESS LICENSING**
- **STREET LIGHTING**
- **SIDEWALKS**
- **TRANSIT**
- **GAS, STEAM, ELECTRICITY**
- **PARKING**
- **ARCHITECTURAL CONSERVATION**
- **RECREATION**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of this list of local responsibilities with the addition of "municipal drains" and "local roads" and the transfer of "fire services" from this recommendation to recommendation #20 as a permissive service for both local municipalities and/or counties to provide for.

The Association is in agreement that there should be a list of functions which local municipalities should have sole responsibility for. The Association is of the view that this list should generally be interpreted to be seen as guidelines given that there may be other functions which may have been overlooked or that there may be additional functions which certain local municipalities may be willing to provide. AMO is of the view that this list is accurate to some extent but that "municipal drains" and "local roads" are major services currently provided at the local level in an effective matter and that these services should also be included in this list.

In addition, the Association has received communications from some members suggesting that fire services should perhaps be provided at the county level. In keeping with the theme of local autonomy and individual flexibility.

The Association supports this recommendation as amended by these suggestions.

20. **IN ADDITION TO ROADS, LIBRARIES, MUSEUMS AND PARKS, BOTH COUNTIES AND LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES BE GIVEN PERMISSIVE AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE FOR THE FOLLOWING:**

- **ACQUISITION AND SERVICING OF INDUSTRIAL LAND**
- **EMERGENCY PLANNING**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of this recommendation as amended by the additions of economic development, sewer and water and fire services as proposed in the responses to recommendations 18 and 19, and the addition of the consent granting function as proposed in the response to recommendation 21.

The Association is supportive of the points recommended in terms of permissive authority for both counties and local municipalities. In addition, the Association would like to add the services of economic development, sewer and water and fire services as explained in the responses to recommendations 18 and 19 as well as the addition of the consent granting function as proposed in the response to recommendation 21.

Permissive authority for both counties and local municipalities to deliver these services again recognizes that there are very real distinctions between the counties in Ontario and the individual studies which will be undertaken will surely examine these matters in terms of which level should appropriately deliver the service or whether or not the service should be shared in some fashion, e.g. county co-ordination of local emergency planning.

21. **RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE LAND USE PLANNING FUNCTION BE DIVIDED BETWEEN COUNTIES AND LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES IN THE FOLLOWING WAY:**

- **COUNTIES BE REQUIRED TO ADOPT A COUNTY OFFICIAL PLAN AND TO ADMINISTER THE CONSENT GRANTING PROCESS, WITH NO DELEGATION TO LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES; AND**

- **LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES BE RESPONSIBLE FOR LOCAL PLANNING IMPLEMENTATION INCLUDING ZONING, SITE PLAN CONTROL AND PLANS OF SUBDIVISION AND HAVE PERMISSIVE AUTHORITY TO ADOPT A LOCAL OFFICIAL PLAN, WHICH WOULD HAVE TO CONFORM WITH THE COUNTY OFFICIAL PLAN.**

The Association recognizes the value of official plans and is of the view that each local municipality should be required to adopt a local official plan to conform with the county official plan. This will ensure that the local constituent municipalities within the county have thoroughly considered their future development options and will thereby make for a stronger county plan with a more solid base of local support.

In addition, the Association suggests that in addition to the items identified on the list as areas to be addressed, local municipalities should also address the matter of "local servicing" as an integral part of future development planning.

24. **IN THE STRENGTHENED COUNTY SYSTEM ENVISAGED, COUNTIES AND THE CURRENT SEPARATED MUNICIPALITIES JOIN FORCES TO PROMOTE THE MUTUAL SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC INTERESTS OF THE AREA AND ITS CITIZENS. THIS COOPERATIVE APPROACH MIGHT TAKE THE FORM OF THE INTEGRATION OF A SEPARATED MUNICIPALITY INTO THE COUNTY STRUCTURE, OR, IF SEPARATION CONTINUES, AN IMPROVED, MORE STABLE WORKING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SEPARATED MUNICIPALITY AND THE COUNTY.**

(A) **THE INTEGRATION OF SEPARATED MUNICIPALITIES INTO THE COUNTY SYSTEM SHOULD BE PURSUED AS AN APPROACH:**

- **TO AVOID FUTURE BOUNDARY DISPUTES;**
- **TO REMOVE THE COMPETITION FOR ASSESSMENT THROUGH THE POOLING OF COSTS AND BENEFITS;**
- **TO REDIRECT THE RESOURCES, ENERGY AND CREATIVITY OF THE INVOLVED MUNICIPAL UNITS TO PROMOTE THE SHARED INTERESTS OF THE AREA; AND**
- **TO CREATE A STRONG FOCUS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN THE AREA.**

(B) **WHERE INTEGRATION IS NOT ACHIEVED, A STRENGTHENED, MORE STABLE WORKING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE COUNTY AND THE SEPARATED MUNICIPALITY BE FACILITATED THROUGH THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COUNTY-SEPARATED MUNICIPALITY LIAISON COMMITTEE TO OVERSEE SHARED SERVICES. THESE COMMITTEES SHOULD BE STRUCTURED IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:**

- **SUCH COMMITTEES SHALL BE COMPOSED OF COUNCIL MEMBERS AND SHOULD HAVE NO MORE THAN 8 MEMBERS;**

- REPRESENTATION ON THE COMMITTEE BE BASED ON EQUAL REPRESENTATION; AND

- POLICY DECISIONS OF THE COMMITTEE MUST BE RATIFIED BY THE COUNCILS OF THE COUNTY AND THE SEPARATED MUNICIPALITY.

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of 24(A) and suggests that 24(B) be amended by deleting the phrase "and should have no more than 8 members" from the first point.

The Association recognizes the value of separated cities and counties joining forces to promote the mutual interests of the area. While it is clear that there are benefits to separated municipalities integrating back in to the county system, it is also clear that in the majority of counties with separated municipalities, there is a reluctance on the part of one or both parties to do so due to the vast differences in size and population and/or a number of other relevant factors.

The Association appreciates the inclusion of the encouragement of a more stable working relationship between the county and the separated municipality in areas where integration is unworkable. The proposed liaison committee to oversee shared services is a useful idea. However, the Association recommends the deletion of the phrase, "and should have no more than 8 members" from the first point listed under 24(B). The Association, having recognized the uniqueness and diversity of the counties in Ontario, opposes the selection of a standardized number which is to be applied in all situations.

The Association believes that should a county wish to establish such a committee as a result of their county study, that such a committee should be established in a manner which best recognizes the appropriate parties in a representative fashion. The county and the separated municipalities are in the best position to decide upon that composition and membership themselves.

25. **COUNTIES AND LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES UNDERTAKE A COUNTY-WIDE PROPERTY TAX REASSESSMENT.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of this recommendation as amended to include separated municipalities so that the recommendation will read:

> **"Counties, local municipalities and separated municipalities undertake a county-wide property tax reassessment."**

The Association has historically been in favour of county-wide reassessment and continues to support such reassessment in order to improve the fairness of the property tax system by using consistent standards. AMO recognizes that different counties are at different stages with respect to reassessment but suggests that counties promote market value reassessment as the end result.

In addition, the Association recommends an amendment to the recommendation so that it will include "separated municipalities". The Association is of the view that in order to achieve what is intended to be a fair and understandable system of assessment, separated municipalities should operate on similar standards as the surrounding county.

26. **IN ORDER TO MOVE TOWARDS THE STRENGTHENED COUNTY-LOCAL MUNICIPAL SYSTEM ENVISAGED IN THE POLICY STATEMENT, THE PROVINCE ADOPT A MULTI-PRONGED IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY. THE IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY WOULD INCLUDE INDIVIDUAL COUNTY STUDIES, PROVINCIAL PROGRAM AND GRANT INCENTIVES AND LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of this recommendation provided that:

A) **Proposed grant incentives and legislative initiatives do not adversely affect municipal finances; and**

B) **A review process be provided for in the event the goals of the county and the Province are not being met.**

The Association is in agreement with the proposed implementation strategy as a means by which to assist in attempting to achieve an improved county-local system. The Association is supportive of the process as described, through individual county studies, legislative initiatives and grant incentives provided that any such grant incentives do not affect municipal finances in a negative fashion.

In addition, the Association would like to see a review process provided for in the event that the goals of the individual county and the goals of the Province are not both being achieved. That is, if any component of the implementation strategy is adversely affecting the goals of either party, it would be useful to allow a review process to attempt to correct that inequity.

The Association is therefore supportive of such an implementation strategy subject to the inclusion of these two provisions.

27. **A STUDY BE UNDERTAKEN IN EACH COUNTY IN ORDER TO CONSIDER REORGANIZATION OF THE COUNTY STRUCTURE IN LINE WITH THE DIRECTIONS OUTLINED IN THE GOVERNMENT POLICY STATEMENT.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of this recommendation but would request changing the word "directions" to "principles" in order to conform with the wording used in recommendation #2.

The Association has stated its support for recommendation #2 which outlines the statements of principle to be included in the policy statement on county government and is therefore supportive of the concept of individual studies being undertaken in each county in an attempt to achieve these statements of principle.

As mentioned previously, the Association is of the view that each county is unique in its own manner and that in order to accommodate the diversity of each county, it is only fair to assess each one on its own merits and not to predetermine such things as minimum population levels and maximum size councils without individual analysis.

The Association is currently aware of ten counties which have already requested county review studies. These counties are proactively seeking an improved county/local municipal arrangement and should be commended for their action to date. Given that the Ministry of Municipal Affairs has commenced work on individual county studies, it appears that for some, the process is already taking shape.

Once again, the Association supports individual county studies as the preferred manner in which to strengthen the county/local environment and to improve service delivery based on the particular circumstances of that part of the Province.

28. **EACH STUDY BE CONDUCTED BY A COUNTY STEERING COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF NOT MORE THAN FIVE LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS REPRESENTING THE DIFFERENT INTERESTS IN THE COUNTY. THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WOULD BE APPOINTED BY COUNTY COUNCIL AND THE COUNCILS OF THE SEPARATED MUNICIPALITIES, IF APPROPRIATE.**

* **WHERE A SEPARATED MUNICIPALITY IS NOT REPRESENTED ON THE STEERING COMMITTEE STUDYING THE COUNTY IN WHICH THE SEPARATED MUNICIPALITY IS LOCATED, THE STEERING COMMITTEE WOULD BE REQUIRED TO FORMALLY REQUEST REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SEPARATED MUNICIPALITY TO PARTICIPATE IN DISCUSSING MATTERS OF MUTUAL INTEREST.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of the recommendation as amended as follows:

> **"Each study be conducted by a county steering committee representing different interests in the county. The committee members would be appointed by the county council and the councils of the separated municipalities."**

The Association agrees that each study should be conducted by a county steering committee which is comprised of representatives of different interests in the county. However, the Association once again opposes an attempt to set a Provincially imposed standard sized number to the committee, in this case, 5. Once again, the Association is of the view that the appropriate sized committee can be determined by the county based on appropriate representation by different interests within the county.

In addition, AMO is of the view that if a separated municipality is contained within the county boundaries, that separated municipality should be represented on the steering committee regardless. As a first step to promoting closer relations, the separated city must be formally represented and will undoubtably take great interest in discussions of service questions and any proposed restructuring regardless of whether or not the separated city is intending to rejoin the county.

The Association recommends that a locally comprised committee which formally includes separated city representation will be more representative and will therefore ultimately put forward a higher quality final product.

29. **THE PROVINCE PROVIDE UP TO 50 PER CENT FUNDING FOR HIRING A FACILITATOR AND/OR FOR UNDERTAKING BACKGROUND STUDIES AND PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE AS APPROPRIATE.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of the recommendation as amended as follows:

> **"The Province provide a minimum of 50 percent funding of all costs including background studies and any professional assistance as appropriate."**

The Association is of the view that the phrase "up to 50 percent funding" is not enough of a Provincial financial commitment to what could be a very costly process while a minimum of 50 percent funding ensures a much more equitable financial partnership between the Province and the individual county.

In addition, the Association has removed the reference to the facilitator due to the fact that some counties may have the appropriate in-house expertise to conduct this function.

30. **THE TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR A REORGANIZATION STUDY BE DEVELOPED BY THE COUNTY STEERING COMMITTEE, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE MINISTRY OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS. THE TERMS OF REFERENCE SHOULD:**

* **ADDRESS THE ISSUES RAISED IN THE GOVERNMENT POLICY STATEMENT;**

* **PROVIDE FOR AN ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT OF REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS; AND**

* **SET OUT A CONSULTATION PROCESS.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of the recommendation as amended as follows:

> **"The terms of reference for a reorganization study be developed by the county steering committee, in consultation with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs.**

The Association is of the view that because the Ministry of Municipal Affairs will have to approve the undertaking of a county study including the terms of reference, that the final part of recommendation 30 appears to be redundant and need not be included.

31. **EACH STUDY BE COMPLETED WITHIN A ONE-YEAR TIME PERIOD AND THAT, AT THE TIME OF COMPLETION, THE STUDY COMMITTEE MAKE ITS RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNTY COUNCIL AND THROUGH IT, TO LOCAL MUNICIPAL COUNCILS, TO THE COUNCILS OF ANY SEPARATED MUNICIPALITIES AFFECTED AND TO THE MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS.**

* **COUNTY COUNCIL AND ANY SEPARATED MUNICIPALITIES AFFECTED WOULD BE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS WITHIN 3 MONTHS OF RECEIPT OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of the recommendation.

The Association is of the view that this is a timeframe which will ensure commitment and dedication to the process.

32. **THE PROVINCE INITIALLY SUPPORT STUDIES IN THE FOUR COUNTIES WHERE AN INTEREST HAS BEEN EXPRESSED IN REORGANIZING (BRUCE, LANARK, PRESCOTT AND RUSSELL, LAMBTON). THESE FOUR STUDIES ARE TO BE COMPLETED WITHIN ONE YEAR.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of this recommendation.

The Association recognizes that other requests have come forward since the release of the report of the consultation committee and trusts that these can also be completed within the one year time frame from their commencement.

33. **THE STUDIES BE COMPLETED IN ALL 26 COUNTIES WITHIN FIVE YEARS.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of this recommendation.

The Association is of the view that five years is an appropriate time within which to complete all 26 studies and would urge both counties and the Province to attempt to meet this deadline.

34. **APPROPRIATE STAFF IN THE MINISTRY OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS BE DESIGNATED AND IDENTIFIED TO COORDINATE EACH INDIVIDUAL COUNTY STUDY.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of the recommendation as amended as follows:

> **"Appropriate staff in the Ministry of Municipal Affairs be designated and identified to assist each individual county study."**

The Association felt that the word "assist" would more appropriately represent the perceived role of Ministry of Municipal Affairs' staff in the process rather than "co-ordinate" which implies a certain amount of leadership and control over the study process.

35. **THE PROVINCE REALIGN ITS CONDITIONAL AND UNCONDITIONAL GRANT PROGRAMS, UNDER WHICH TRANSFER PAYMENTS ARE MADE TO MUNICIPALITIES, TO REMOVE ANY DETERRENTS TO THE AMALGAMATION OF SMALL MUNICIPALITIES AND TO CREATE INCENTIVES TO PROMOTE THE FORMATION OF LARGER UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of the recommendation as amended as follows:

> **"The Province realign its conditional and unconditional grant programs, under which transfer payments are made to municipalities to remove any deterrents to the amalgamation of municipalities."**

The Association is currently involved in a joint committee with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs to examine the current transfer payment system and the manner in which Provincial funding is provided to municipalities. While the outcome of the work of that committee will most certainly affect the manner in which any changes are made to the transfer payment system, the Association would like to advise that it is supportive of the removal of deterrents to the amalgamation of municipalities but strongly questions the creation of incentives to promote the formation of larger municipal units.

AMO feels that offering incentives to the formation of larger units will result in unfair treatment for municipalities generally and is therefore opposed to that portion of the recommendation.

While AMO is suggesting a revised recommendation on this matter, the entire transfer payment system is, of course, subject to any changes which may come about as a result of the AMO/Municipal Affairs committee currently working on this subject.

36. **OTHER PROVINCIAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS WHICH DIFFERENTIATE BY MUNICIPAL POPULATION SIZE BE REVIEWED AND REVISED TO REMOVE ANY DETERRENTS TO AMALGAMATIONS AND TO CREATE INCENTIVES TO PROMOTE THE FORMATION OF LARGER UNITS OF LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of this recommendation as amended as follows:

> **"Other Provincial policies and programs be revised to promote workable units of local government as determined by the individual county reviews."**

While the Association agrees with an examination of Provincial policies and programs, it is of the view that the goal should not necessarily be "larger" but "more workable" units of local government. The Association is uncomfortable with creating incentives in Provincial policies and is of the view that the revised version of the recommendation put forward adequately addresses this subject. The Association emphasizes the importance of the individual county reviews in determining workable units of government in each area.

37. **THE MINISTRY OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL OF COUNTY OFFICIAL PLANS BY:**

(A) **GIVING PRIORITY FUNDING THROUGH AN ENHANCED GRANT PROGRAM DESIGNED TO ACCELERATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF COUNTY OFFICIAL PLANS. THE ENHANCED GRANT PROGRAM SHOULD BE FLEXIBLE. CONSIDERATION SHOULD ALSO BE GIVEN TO PROVIDING AN OPERATING SUBSIDY TO ENCOURAGE COUNTIES TO HIRE PLANNING STAFF.**

(B) **ENSURING SUFFICIENT MINISTRY STAFF RESOURCES TO ASSIST COUNTIES IN DEVELOPING OFFICIAL PLANS AND TO PROVIDE FOR EXPEDITIOUS PROCESSING THROUGH THE PROVINCIAL APPROVAL PROCESS.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of the recommendation.

The Association is in agreement with the methods outlined to encourage the development of county official plans.

38. **THE MINISTRY OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS GIVE PRIORITY TO ASSISTING MUNICIPAL STAFF AND POLITICIANS IN UNDERSTANDING THE LAND USE PLANNING PROCESS. THIS ASSISTANCE COULD INCLUDE PUBLICATIONS, SEMINARS AND VIDEO TAPES.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of this recommendation.

The Association recognizes that this may be necessary in light of a greater county involvement in the planning process.

39. **THE MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS NOT APPROVE FUTURE SEPARATIONS OF MUNICIPALITIES FROM THE COUNTY SYSTEM.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of this recommendation.

The Association is in agreement that future separations should not be permitted and within strengthened county systems.

40. **A POLICY BE DEVELOPED ON ANNEXATIONS BY SEPARATED MUNICIPALITIES IN ORDER TO PROTECT THE INTERESTS OF COUNTIES AND SEPARATED MUNICIPALITIES AND TO PROMOTE THE PROVINCIAL INTEREST.**

AMO Position

The Association is supportive of the recommendation as amended as follows:

> **"A policy be developed on annexations by separated municipalities in order to protect the interests of all affected municipalities and to promote the Provincial interest, and that such a policy set deadlines and add an arbitration process."**

The Association is supportive of the development of a policy on annexations and is of the view that two methods of improvement are setting of specific deadlines and developing a type of arbitration process. The Association is of the view that it is important to include a reference to protecting all affected municipalities as well as the provincial interest.

41. THE LEGISLATION BE AMENDED TO IMPLEMENT THOSE ASPECTS OF THE VISION OF A STRONG COUNTY-LOCAL MUNICIPAL SYSTEM WHICH CAN BE ADOPTED PROVINCE-WIDE. THESE AMENDMENTS WOULD INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- COUNTIES BE GIVEN THE AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES.

- COUNTIES BE REQUIRED TO ADOPT AN OFFICIAL PLAN, AND AUTHORITY TO DELEGATE CONSENT GRANTING BE REMOVED.

- EFFECTIVE FOR THE 1991 MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS, TOWN MAYORS BE MADE THE TOWN REPRESENTATIVE ON COUNTY COUNCILS, AND ANY ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIVES BE ELECTED AS COUNTY COUNCILLORS TO SIT ON BOTH THE LOCAL AND COUNTY COUNCILS.

- TEMPORARY SUBSTITUTION OF REPRESENTATIVES ON COUNTY COUNCILS BE CLEARLY PROHIBITED.

- COUNTY COUNCILS BE GIVEN THE AUTHORITY:

  - TO ADOPT, BY BY-LAW, A THREE-YEAR TERM FOR THE HEAD OF COUNTY COUNCIL, PROVIDED THAT THE TERM DOES NOT EXTEND BEYOND THE TERM OF COUNCIL, AND

  - TO ELECT THE HEAD OF COUNCIL TO ADDITIONAL TERMS OF OFFICE

- GREATER FLEXIBILITY BE PROVIDED IN THE SIZE OF MUNICIPAL COUNCILS.

- CITY STATUS BE PERMITTED WITHIN COUNTIES.

- TOWNSHIPS BE PERMITTED TO APPLY TO THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD FOR THE DISSOLUTION OF POLICE VILLAGES WITHIN THEIR BOUNDARIES.

* **AUTHORITY BE GIVEN FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT CITY-COUNTY COMMITTEES, WITH STANDARDIZED PROVISIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP, TERMS OF OFFICE AND AUTHORITY.**

* **COUNTIES BE ENABLED TO RECEIVE LEVIES FROM LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES IN INSTALLMENTS WITHOUT BEING REQUIRED TO ESTABLISH THE AGREEMENT OF ALL LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES. THE DATES FOR PAYMENT WOULD BE SET OUT IN LEGISLATION; HOWEVER, INDIVIDUAL COUNTIES COULD ESTABLISH ALTERNATE PROVISIONS BY BY-LAW.**

* **COUNTIES BE ALLOWED TO ISSUE THE SAME TYPES OF DEBENTURES AS LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES.**

* **THE PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACT BE AMENDED TO PROVIDE COUNTIES WITH THE AUTHORITY TO ISSUE DEBENTURES ON BEHALF OF COUNTY LIBRARY BOARDS FOR CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PURPOSES.**

<u>AMO Position</u>

The Association is supportive of the recommendation with the exception of the following points which should be amended so as to read:

Point 2

> **"Counties be required to adopt an official plan."**

Point 9

> **"Authority be given for the establishment of joint city-county committees, with provisions for membership, terms of office and authority to make recommendations to their supporting councils."**

These positions as amended ensure consistency with the recommendations and rationales stated in earlier areas of the report. For example, the Association has recommended that consent granting authority be examined in terms of the individual county reviews in terms of whether or not that function is best administered at the county or the local level.

In addition, the amendment to the ninth point is made in that the Association is opposed to standardized provisions for membership, etc. and is of the view that local municipalities can best determine such matters as committee membership on their own. In addition, the Association would like to clarify that such a committee is empowered and has the authority to make recommendations to their respective municipal councils.

The Association would also add an additional point to the twelve which are outlined. This additional point would read as follows:

> **"That the heads of all municipalities within the county system in Ontario be given the title of "mayor".**

The Association is supportive of recommendation 41 as amended in that it is consistent with the positions outlined throughout the text of the AMO response.

OTHER MATTERS

In the introduction, the Association referred to the status of recommendations contained within the "Patterns for the Future" report which were not addressed in the "County Government in Ontario" report. The Association trusts that the individual county reviews will be complete in the sense that the question of the role and representation with respect to special purpose bodies will be addressed in the individual reviews.

In addition, the Association would like to be advised as to the timetable of events with respect to the continuation of this process. In a letter dated July 6, 1989 addressed to Stephen Clark, President, AMO from the Honourable John Eakins, Minister of Municipal Affairs, the following statement was made:

> "I want to stress that the report is not a government report, but a report submitted to me for consideration. At some point in the near future the government will indicate, through a discussion paper, our proposed direction and allow ample opportunity for response and comments to any government proposals."

Since it is the Association's understanding that county review studies have begun, the Association would be interested in knowing whether the government is committed to such reviews and what terms of reference will be selected. The Association is concerned that reviews may begin without government commitment to funding and the principles contained in the report. In this regard, the Association would appreciate an update with respect to this matter.

CONCLUSIONS

The Association of Municipalities of Ontario recognizes, along with its many member municipalities that county government in Ontario is in need of some sort of reform. This is clearly demonstrated in the fact that 10 counties to date have requested individual reviews of their particular county situation, both in terms of representation and responsibilities.

While the Association is pleased to see the recommendation of individual county reviews outlined in the report, the thrust and philosophy of the AMO response is that only through individual county review can each county determine the individual characteristics which best achieve the difficult balance between representation by population and a workable federation. In this sense, the Association remains unalterably opposed to the imposition of a standardized numbering system across the Province with respect to any issue.

A similar point can be made with respect to functions and responsibilities and the level of provision of most services which can only be determined through individual county review. With the exception of the selection of title for clarity purposes and two or three standard issues, the services to be provided by a rapidly urbanizing county need not be the same as those provided by a sparsely populated and homogeneously rural county.

The Association has therefore placed much faith in the individual county studies which are to be undertaken as outlined in the report. This is a faith in local autonomy which recognizes the flexibility and inherent differences which exist across the Province.

The Association urges the Ministry of Municipal Affairs to adopt such a localized approach and to consider the positions contained within this response.

APPENDIX A

MEMBERSHIP OF THE 1989 JOINT SECTION COMMITTEE ON COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Michael Bradley
Mayor, City of Sarnia
Chairman, Large Urban Section and Chairman

Peter Atcheson
Director of Planning, City of Brantford
Member, Large Urban Section

Richard Bolton
Councillor, County of Middlesex
Member, County and Regional Section

Al Bouwers
Mayor, Township of Osgoode
Member, Rural Section (ROMA)

Harold Bruce
Councillor, County of Victoria
Member, County and Regional Section

John Clemens
Reeve, Village of Tweed
Past Chairman, Small Urban Section (OSUM)

Tom Cunningham
Councillor, County of Huron
Second Vice-Chairman, Rural Section (ROMA)

Bill Mickle
Reeve, Town of Exeter
Member, Small Urban Section (OSUM)

Resource:
Mark Emery
Manager of Section Services, AMO

PUBLICATIONS ISSUED IN THE "AMO REPORT" SERIES

87-1	A Proposed Model of Collective Bargaining and Required Amendments for the Fire Departments Act
87-2	Response to the Final Report of the Advisory Committee to the Minister of Municipal Affairs on Municipal Liability Insurance in Ontario
87-3	Response to the 1986 Draft on Flood Plain Planning Policy Statement
87-4	Response to the Rental Housing Protection Act
87-5	The Future of Social Assistance in Ontario - Report to the Social Assistance Review Committee
87-6	AMO Submission to Provincial Premier and Executive Council of Ontario
87-7	Recommendations on the Pay Equity Act
87-8	AMO Discussion Paper on Lot Levies and Front-End Financing
87-9	A Proposed Model of Collective Bargaining and Required Amendments for the Police Act
87-10	Response to Bill 106 - An Act to Amend the Occupational Health and Safety Act
87-11	Unconditional Grants Proposal for 1988
87-12	The Licensing of Businesses by Municipalities
88-1	Education Funding in Ontario
88-2	Preliminary Response to New Directions for Child Care
88-3	1988 Provincial Budget Submission
88-4	AMO Submission to Provincial Cabinet
88-5	AMO Response to the Report of the Advisory Committee on County Government: "Patterns for the Future"
88-6	Pressures on the Partnership: Response to the Provincial-Municipal Social Services Review Discussion Paper
88-7	AMO's Unconditional Grants Proposal for 1989
88-8	AMO's Response to "Rental Housing Protection Act: Future Directions"
88-9	Municipal Authority to Regulate Occupancy on the Basis of Relationship
88-10	AMO Response to Bill 170 - Aggregates Resources Act
88-11	AMO Position on "Controlling Industrial Discharges to Sewers"
88-12	AMO Response to "A Review of the Conservation Authorities Program"
88-13	AMO Response to Bill 174, The Intervenor Funding Project
89-1	AMO Brief to the Province of Ontario: 1989-90 Transfer Payment Announcement
89-2	AMO Response to "Financing Growth-related Capital Needs"
89-3	AMO Report on the Draft Housing Policy Statement
89-4	Property Tax: a Provincial Tax? AMO Presentation to the Standing Committee of Finance and Economic Affairs

89-5 "Salvaging the Partnership": 1989 AMO Provincial Submission to Cabinet

89-6 Response to "Transitions", The Report of the Social Assistance Review Committee

89-7 Review of Bill 20 - An Act to provide for the Payment of Development Charges

89-8 Response to "County Government in Ontario"

89-9 Response to Draft Wetlands Planning Policy Statement

• AMO Waste Management Study: The Waste Management Planning and Approvals Process ($15)

Copies of all the reports in this series are available at $10.00 each, except as noted for postage and handling, prepaid, from: Publications Centre, Association of Municipalities of Ontario, 100 University Avenue, Suite 805, Toronto, Ontario, M5J 1V6. Please make cheques payable to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario.